

special
collections
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

T H E

Bishop of Salisbury's

Proper D E F E N C E,

F R O M A

S P E E C H

Cry'd about the Streets in his Name,

A N D

Said to have been Spoken by him in the House of
Lords, upon the

B I L L

Against

OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY.

Sold by the Booksellers of *London* and
Westminster. 1704.

109.1704.246

*The Bishop of Salisbury's Proper Defence,
from a Speech Cry'd about the Streets in his
Name, and said to have been Spoken by him
in the House of Lords, upon the Bill against
Occasional Conformity.*

THE *Licence* of this *Age*, and of the *Press* is so great, that no *Rank* or *Quality* of Men is free from the *Insults* of Loose and Extravagant *Wits*.

The good *Bishop* of *Salisbury* has had a Plentiful Share in this sort of Treatment. And now at last, some or other has Presum'd to *Burlesque* his *Lordship*, in *Printing* a *Speech* for him, which none that knows his *Lordship* can believe ever came from him.

But because it may go down with others, who are too Apt to take *Slander* upon *Trust* ; And that his *Lordship* has already been *Pelted* with several *Answers* to his *Speech*, I have Presum'd to offer the following Considerations, to Clear his *Lordship* from the Suspicion of having vented (in such an *August* Assembly) those *Crude* and *Undigested* Matter, which are set forth in that *Speech* ; and which so Highly *Reflects* upon his *Lordship's* self !

1. The first Reason given for *Rejecting* the *Bill* against *Occasional Conformity*, at this time, is for Preserving of *Unity* among our selves.

Was then the *Rejecting* a *Bill* which had been Carry'd on, with so much *Zeal* in the *House of Commons*, and *Voted* there in two *Sessions* Successively, by a great *Majority*, more than had usually been seen in other Cases; And on which they laid so Great a *Stress*, no less than the Preservation of both *Church* and *State*, at this time; Was the *Rejecting* such a *Bill* as this, on which the *Commons* Set their Hearts, more Likely to Create *Union* or *Division* betwixt the two *Houses*? And if a *Division* (as the Event has shew'd) is that the most Probable way to *Lessen* or *Enflame* the two Contending *Parties* through the *Kingdom*?

Can any Man Imagine my Lord *Bishop of Sarum* to be Guilty of such *Reasoning* as this?

And tho' the *House of Commons* have shew'd great *Temper* and *Moderation* under this *Disappointment*, of having their *Bill* Rejected, without so much as a *Conference* or Hearing their *Reasons*, or Giving any to them; even at the first Reading; yet will this take away the *Heart-burning* of the Friends of the Establish'd *Church* throughout the Nation? All of whom cannot be suppos'd Masters of such *Caution* and *Wisdom* as that which Governs that Great and *Honourable Assembly*.

And it must be Confess'd, that the *House of Commons*, for this Reason, and to make no *Disturbance*,

sturbance, have been very *Passive* ; more than we have seen, in lesser Matters, for some Ages.

And now that the Matter is so far over ; and the *Parliament* up ; wou'd the Bishop of *Sarum's* great *Prudence* and *Moderation* give him Leave to *Print* a *Speech* made during the *Heat* of those *Debates*, to *Rub* the *Sore* over again, and *Provoke* a fresh ? This wou'd look rather like *Carrying* on the *War*, than letting it *Sleep*. And as if there were some further *Designs* still in *View* !

The Differences between the two *Houses*, at their last *Session*. Occasion'd Principally as we conceive, by the *Lords* Rejecting the *Bill*, may perhaps prove of Greater ill Consequence to the Support of our *Allies*, and *Portugal* and *Savoy* especially Quoted in the *Speech*, and make wider Differences in the Nation, than the Passing the *Bill* wou'd have done. There cannot possibly be a less Sign of that *Happy Calm* the *Speech* says the *Nation* is now in, than the Extraordinary and almost Un-presidented Differences between the two *Houses* ; which may Render all Proceedings between them almost Impracticable, which the *Bishop* of *Sarum* cannot *Wish*, or *Contribute* towards it.

2. Is it Possible, that his *Lordship* of *Sarum*, wou'd so far *Expose* himself, as to *Arraign* all our *Protestant Princes* ever since the *Reformation*, one after another, as this *Speech* does, with all their *Parliaments* and *Councils* ; And to Give that for his *Second Reason* against the *Bill* ? And that among

them all, he shou'd lay most Load upon the wife Queen *Elizabeth*, and her *Councils*, for the Strict hand they kept over the *Dissenters*: And call that the *Blemish*, which all wise Men and *Writers* own to have been the *Security* of her *Reign*. And the Example of the after *Reigns* have Prov'd it to a Demonstration !

This Accuses likewise all the *Christian Kings* ever since *Constantine*. who, as *Custodes Utriusque Tabulæ* thought themselves oblig'd to make Severe *Laws*, and *Punish* Exemplarily those who made *Schisms* and *Divisions* in the *Church*. But his *Lordship* is too well Acquainted with the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*, and the *Histories* of those times, to let any thing so *Reproachful* upon them fall from him.

This is the same Argument which the Mutinous *Congregation* made use of against *Moses* and *Aaron*, for their *Severity* in the Business of *Korah* (which was only a Dispute betwixt *Episcopacy* and *Presbytery*, and no Part of their *Worship* or *Doctrines* concern'd) *Saying, Ye have Killed the People of the Lord*. Num. xvi. 41.

These were more *Capital Proceedings* than those this *Speech* Complains of in *Queen Elizabeth's Reign*; and the severe *Act* in the 35 Year of it, that *Punishes Meetings with Imprisonment, Banishment, and Death*. But this *Speech* go's on, and says, That the *Repeal* of that *Act* past in both Houses in *King Charles's time*. He do's not tell in which *King Charles's time*. This is one of this Author's *Secrets* ! But adds, *And it is known by what Management it was, that it was not tendred*

to the Royal Assent. Here again he do's not tell to whom *it is known*, And I dare say there were many in that House who knew nothing at all of it, and therefore ought to have been Inform'd. How cou'd any Man make the *Bishop of Sarum* speak in such a *Blind* and *Gossiping* Manner, in things that requir'd the *Clearest Proof* !

Next he falls upon King *James I.* and says, *The Severities in his Reign cast a Blot on it.* But he Names none. That wou'd have been a *Task*. It was so far otherwise, That his *Loosning* the *Reigns* of *Government*, which Queen *Elizabeth* kept *Streit* upon the *Necks* of the *Dissenters*, gave them Opportunity to Embroil and Disturb his *Reign* in *England*, as they had, in most Barbarous manner, done before in *Scotland*.

One wou'd have thought he should have slipt over the *Reign* of his Son King *Charles I.* as to *Severities* us'd by him against the *Dissenters*. Whose Un-precedented *Condescensions* to them Enabl'd them to Cut off his *Head* ! But this *Spiteful Writer* wou'd Miss no one *Episcopal* *Reign*. Therefore says of this, *And the Proceedings in the Star-Chamber, and the High Commission, in his (King James I.) Son's Reign are set forth by a Noble Historian, as things that did not a little Contribute to bring on us the Miseries of a Civil War.*

But did that *Noble Historian* give the *Clamours* that were Rais'd by the *Faction*, on these two Heads, as any Justifiable Reason (had they been True)

True) for what he calls the *Rebellion* ? But this *Writer* calls it only a *Civil War*. And again in this *Speech*, p. 7. *before the Wars*, says he. This is the *Shibboleth* of the *Whiggs*, who will not Allow that *War* to have been a *Rebellion*. But a Just *Vindication* of their *Rights* and *Liberties*. And if the *Bishop* of *Sarum* had thought so, yet he wou'd not have Discover'd himself so far, as to Run into the *Cant* of the *Party*.

Again, so *Correct* a *Writer* as the *Bishop* is known to be, wou'd have Quoted the Place in the *Noble Historian* and not hid himself in *Generals*, which always give Suspicion, and put the Reader to Stage over the several large *Volumes* in *Folio*, and then only to *Guess* what he wou'd be at.

He wou'd not, as *Doctor K.* in a Pretended *Vindication* of this *Prince*, on the *Anniversary* of his *Martyrdom*, having Exemplify'd at large all the *Charges* of the *Rebells* against him, without one word in his *Justification*, either as to the *Falsehood* of the *Facts* Alledg'd; or the *Wickedness* of *Rebelling* on that Account, had they been True. He wou'd not have told the Tale all on one side. At which Rate, the Best *Actions* in the *World* may be Mis-Represented. And a *Vindication* of this sort, is the Bitterest *Invective* that can be Contriv'd. They are the *Wounds* of a *Friend*. And Exposes a Man *Open and Defenceless* to the *Darts* of his *Enemies*.

But that *Noble Historian* at the same time that, as a *Faithful Relator of Fact*, and not a *Writer for a Party*, he gives us all the *Mis-managements* of that *Reign*, in their full *Weight*; yet he *Conceals* not, as *Rushworth*, what was said and *Pleaded* on the other *Side*; as he did in the *Case of Ship-Money*, in the *Dispute* betwixt *Arch-Bishop Abbot* and *Bishop Laud*, &c. But this *Noble Historians*, having set down all that was objected as to the *Star-Chamber* and *High-Commission*, do's not *Offer to Defend* or *Excuse* any of the *Mis-managements* that were in these *Courts*. And what *Court* ever was there, of so long *Continuance* as these *Courts* had been, wherein no *Mis-management* Cou'd be found? But for *Designing Men* to *Enflame a Nation* and *Raise Rebellion*, on such *Pretences* as never were, or will be *Wanting*, in any *Form of Government* whatsoever, while *Men* have the *Administration*; As it is most *Wicked* before *God*, by whom *Kings* do *Reign*: And utterly *Subverts* all *Constitutions*; So do's it bring with it infinitely *Greater Destruction* and *Ruin* to the *People* of all *Sorts*, than those *Grievances* they pretend to *Redress* by it. Which this *Noble History* do's *Lively* set forth as in a *Picture*. And is of no *Advantage* to this *Speech-maker*. Who go's on to the next *Reign*, and says, *The Proceedings in King Charles the seconds Reign were severe and set on with bad Designs*. He tells not what these *Designs* were. For that would have *Requir'd* some *Proof*! And as to the *Severities*, he

he shou'd have shew'd what they were, and that they were not *Deserv'd* on the side of the *Dissenters*. But be what they will, they are Chargeable on the *Parliament*, more than on the *King*. The first *Parliament* after his *Restoration*, were yet *Smarting* with the *Wounds* they had Receiv'd from the *Bloody Rebellion*; There was not an Honest and *Loyal Family* in *England* that had not Deeply *Suffered* both in *Persons* and *Estates*; that were not yet *Lamenting* their *Fathers*, *Sons*, *Brothers*, or near *Relations*, who had been *Murther'd*, *Imprisoned*, *Banish'd*, *Sequester'd*, &c. And all *Undone*.

So that their *Moderation* is much more to be Admir'd, that they were not more *Severe* against the *Authors* of all this; than that they shou'd make some *Restraining Laws*, to Prevent those *Miseries* being Repeated.

And the Continual Attempts of the same *Faction*, from the very *Year* of the *Restoration*, to the last Minute of that *King's* Life, by new *Rebellions* and *Plots*, to Destroy the *King*, and *Re-Act* their *Tragedy* of *Blood* and *Desolation*, wou'd not suffer the *Parliament* to forget what they had done before; or ever to consent to an *Act* of *Toleration*; tho' often Press'd by the *King* himself. Who not only *Pardon'd* some of the very *Regecides*, and preferr'd the *Heads* of the *Faction* to most of the *Places* of *Power* and *Honour*; but ventur'd *Disputes* with his *Parliament* for several *Indulgences* he Granted to them. For which they well Re-warded

warded him ! And now call his Proceedings *Severe* !

But this *Speech* says, there was a *Secret* in it. *That it will Amaze all that know not the Secret of that time.* This *Secret* we Suppose must be *Popery*, That his *Indulging* the *Dissenters*, was with Design to Break the *Church of England*, and Introduce *Popery*. And so of the *Indulgence* Granted by King *James II.*

But where was the *Severity* to the *Dissenters*, Supposing them *Indulg'd* for this End ? The Greater *Severity* and grand *Design* was against the *Church of England*, as being the Chief Bullwark against *Popery*. And if the *Parliament* saw this, it was a good *Reason* why neither of these two *Kings* cou'd perswade them to pass an *Act* of *Toleration* of the *Dissenters*.

And it makes Good that stated *Politick* of the *Church of Rome*, That the first Step to be made to Ruin the *Church of England*, is, To give *Toleration* to the *Dissenters*. And we have seen that Method pursu'd by as many of our *Kings* as we can suspect to have had that *Design*.

However the Matter of *Fact* is plain, That whatever *Severities* were against the *Dissenters* in the *Reigns* of King *Charles II.* and King *James II.* came from the *Parliament*, and not from either of these *Kings*.

And if we may take the sense of the *People* from their *Representatives* in *Parliament*, then the

Major *Number* and most *Considerable* are, and always have been on the side of the *Church* against the *Dissenters*. Contrary to what they would make us now believe, to *Aggrandize* their *Party*.

If it be said, That the *Parliament* Granted a *Toleration* in the last *Reign*, I will Answer in the words of this *Speech*, That it will *Amaze* all that do not know the *Secret* of that *Time*.

And if no more was then ment than a *Toleration*, the *Parliament* now Agrees with it. But would Explain it, to Extend no further, which is all the *Quarrel*. And may Defeat some *Secrets* ! And gives Us the more *Immediate* Sense of the *Nation*.

This *Speech* thinks it strange, that in the *Reign* of K. *Charles II.* In a time both of *War*, and of a *Plague*, such an *Act* as the *Five Mile Act* shou'd have Pass'd. Was that a Time to Disoblige the *Dissenters*, and put new *Restraints* upon them ? It seems that *Parliament* thought so, and that it was the most Proper *Method* to Secure *Peace* at *Home*, while we were Engag'd in a *War* Abroad. And the *Event* shew'd it, for there were no ill *Consequences* from it, in that *War*. It may be said, that this came from the *Good Nature* of the *Dissenters* ! But it seems that *Parliament* had no mind to Trust wholly to that, but thought some other *Precaution* was necessary.

And the *Council* of their *Great Ones* that Sat in *London*, who receiv'd their *Directions* from An-
ther

ther in *Holland*, who Sat with the *States*; and Concerted the Murder of the *King*, and the *Burning* of *London*; and fix'd that same *Day* for it on which it was *Burn'd*, as was fully Prov'd at the Tryal of *Eight* of them who were *Executed* for it, *four Months* before it came to pass, which you may see in the *London Gazette* of *April 30. 1666.* which yet did not hinder the Execution of their Design in Burning the *City*, the same *Day* that had been Perfix'd. I say this shews, That it was Well for the *Governments* then that they had something Else to Trust to, besides the *Good Nature* of these Men! And that it was but *Necessary* to keep them at *Five Miles* Distance from any *City* or *Town Corporate*, &c. as the *Act* Directs. And this the Rather, because it was then a Time of *War*.

And the *Parliament* might be the more Induc'd to this, for that in the former *Rebellion* of *Forty One*, the *Covenanters* enter'd into a Treaty with the *French King* to Assist them against *K. Charles I.* as is told by their own Historian *Rushworth*, in his *Collections*, *Par. 2. Vol. 2. p. 956,* and *1037. ad Ann. 1639. 15 Carol.* And in the *Lord Clarendon's History* lately Publish'd, *Vol. 1. p. 103,* and *244.* And that was a Time of *War* too.

Now would the *Bishop* of *Sarum* have brought this Instance of the *Five Mile Act*, made in time of *War*. to Fortify his Argument of the *Unseasonableness* of the *Bill* against *Occasional Conformity*, because this is a Time of *War*? His Lordship is

not us'd to Argue thus against himself! And to give no better Reason, than *they who know the Secret of that Time!* What Secret in an Act of Parliament? Let any Read the Act, 17 Car. 2. c. 2. And they will see the Reason, viz. The *Rebellious Principles and Practices*, and *Restless Spirit* of these People.

As little wou'd his Lordship say what follows, *That soon after the Restoration, it had been a very easy thing to have made up all Differences amongst Us; but the Design was to Enflame them, and that matter was far Driven; as we all know.* Now I know no body that *Knows* any such thing, nor, I dare say, this *Writer* neither. For the matter of *Fact* was quite otherwise. The *King* Granted a *Commission* in the Year 1661, to several *Bishops* and *Divines* of the *Church of England*, and to the *Principal* of the *Dissenting Ministers*, to meet together, and see if they cou'd *Compose* Matters, and *Heal the Schism*. The *Dissenters* gave in several *Exceptions* against our *Liturgy*, to have such and such things *Alter'd*. The *Bishops*, &c. did *Consent* to several of their *Alterations*, to shew they were of a *Temper* to *Heal* and *Yeild* as far as they Cou'd. Therefore *Demanded* of the *Dissenters*, to give in *All* their *Exceptions*, so that if they were *Comply'd* with, they wou'd *Promise* to *Conform* and *Heal the Schism*. But this the *Dissenters* Cou'd not be brought to; nor can to this Day. They make many *Exceptions*, but will not
tell

tell any *Conditions* upon which they will *Conform*. Because they will not *Speak out*, That they would have *All*. And nothing less will Please them.

Now the *Bishop* knowing all this to be *Exactly True*, would never give it that *False* and *Malicious Turn*, as in this *Speech*, against the *King* and *Church of England*, in favour of the *Dissenters*, and against the *Bill*.

3. The Third Reason, p. 4. is as little Becoming the *Sagacity*, as *Prudence* and *Honesty* of the *Bishop*. That *the Men who Promoted that Bill without Doors, were known and avow'd Enemies to the Government*. For will not this bring the *Reflection* within *Doors* too? Against all who *Voted* for it. And some of them *Wrote* for it also. And can any think that the *Bishop* would lay himself so open the *second time in Print*, to the *Censure* of that *House*, who had shew'd their *Displeasure* against some of his former *Writings*; which *Touch'd* them not so near as to make them *Known and Avow'd ENEMIES to the Government*!

Were there not *Multitudes of Pamphlets* wrote *without Doors* against that *Bill*? Why then might not some *Write* for it? And how come they to be *Enemies to the Government* more than the others? Is *Writing for the Security of the Church*, being an *Enemy to the Government*.

But must the *Justice* of that *Bill* be measur'd on either side, by the *Qualifications* of those who are *For* or *Against* it? Then, be it known, That
there

there is not one *Deist*, nor one *Socinian* in *England*, but who are every one of them most vehemently *Against* that *Bill*; as well as All the *Whiggs* and *Republicans*. And I may Add, the *Debauchees*, the *Profligate*, and the *Prophane*, who *Despise* and *Ridicule* all *Religion*, and therefore wou'd not be under the *Restraint* of any. And several *Pamphlets* have come from that *Quarter*, Running down the *Bill*, so that we see whom the *Rejecting* that *Bill* did *Gratify*. On the other hand, several of the *Sober* and *Consciencious Dissenters* have found no Fault with it, are Content with their *Toleration*; and think that they ought not, in *Prudence* to Press for more, least they thereby Render themselves *Suspected* to the *Government*; And do Highly *Condemn*, and have *Wrote* against *Occasional Conformity* for *Places*, as a *Reproach* upon their *Profession*; And Desire to be *Distinguish'd* from such.

Therefore it cannot be, That the *Bishop* of *Sarum* shou'd Advance a *Topick*, which so Evidently makes against the *Cause* he wou'd maintain. We must suppose he had other Reasons for Voting against that *Bill*. This cou'd be none of them.

And as little Possible is it that he shou'd *Insinuate Popery* against any one for Proposing, That we should Abate the *Regal Supremacy*, and they (the *Roman Catholicks*) the *Papal*. Is *Abating* the *Pope's Supremacy* a sign of *Inclinations* to *Popery*?

And for the *Regale* or *Regal Supremacy*, the *Bishop* knew very well (unless he wou'd *Censure* a *Book* without *Reading* it) That that *Author* did Agree with his *Lordship's* own Sentiments concerning it. And made great use of his *Lordship's* Authority in it. As p. 66. second *Edit.* his *Lordship* is Quoted, shewing, That the *Bishops* oppos'd the *Queen's* (*Elizabeth's*) *Supremacy*, as set forth in that *Oath* that is, the *Oath of Supremacy*, till it was further Explain'd. And that the *Queen* Refus'd to be call'd *Head* of the *Church*. And That that *Title* cou'd not be justly given to any *Mortal*.

His *Lordship* himself has not thought this Subject Unworthy of his Pen. His Learned *History of the Regale* is still Read with Great Pleasure. Wherein p. 30, &c. p. 93, &c. 190, &c. and p. 209. he give several Instances of *Emperours*, *Kings* and *Princes*, who have Renounc'd and Given up their *Regale*, out of Principle of *Conscience* as not Belonging to them, and a most Wicked thing for them to Retain it, tho' Enjoy'd by their *Ancestors*, and settled on them by the *Laws* of the *Land*. And p. 75. he ascribes the total over-throw of the *Greek Church* to the *Regale* Assum'd by their *Emperours*, in taking the *Election* of *Bishops* to themselves. And coming to the State of the *Latine Church*, he says p. 241. That the *King* and the *Pope* agreed to Divide the Promotion to all *Prelacies* between them.

And do's not this Lead one Naturally to Desire an *Abatement* on Both sides? Did not the *Bishop*

shop think so when he wrote this? And wou'd he call his own Doctrine *Popish*, in Another: Would he Mention a *Book* where all this is Contain'd, with any Unkind *Reflection*; And that only for this? Would it not be to Cast the *Reflection* Directly upon Himself? From whom if that *Author* did not Learn it; Yet we must Suppose he was Mightily *Confirm'd* in it, by the Concurrent Sense of a Man of his Lordship's vast *Capacity* and *Learning*.

In the Book, p. 268, The *Tenths* and *first Fruits* paid by the *Bishops* and *Clergy*, first to the *Pope*, and since to the *Crown*, are likewise Mention'd, as an Unjustifiable Part of the *Regale*, which it were to be Wish'd were Given up. This the *Queen* has most *Christianly* done. Is that *Popery* too! Perhaps it might have been so Call'd in that *Author*, if her *Majesty's* most Gracious Act had not Interv'n'd.

And whenever the Time shall come, that God shall so Move the Heart of any of our *Princes*, to follow the Example of those Godly *Kings* and *Princes* (Mention'd by this Learned *Bishop*) in Giving up their *Regale* likewise as to the *Election* of *Bishops*, and *Presentation* to *Church-Benefices* (which I hope yet to see) I doubt not it will be Receiv'd with as Universal a *Joy* and *Acclamations* of *Gratitude*, by the *Clergy*, as they have Express'd for her *Majesty's* Grant of the *Tenths* and *First Fruits*. And will be thought as little *Popery* as that.

And

And which is most of all, the *Dissenters* (whom we now *Court* !) cannot Except against it. For it is the Avow'd *Principle* of them all, of whatsoever *Denominations*. And the *Eraastianism* of our *Regale*, is their most Clamorous *Objection* against Us. And the only one that has any *Appearance* of *Truth* in it. For it is most Certain that *Christ* did not Build his *Church* upon the *Foundation* of *Kings* and *Parliaments*, but of the *Apostles* and their *Successors* ; and Established a *Regiment* of the *Church* within her self, *Independent* of all *Earthly Powers*. By which she was Govern'd in her *First* and *Purest* *Ages* ; And stood the *Shock* of the most violent *Persecutions* from the *Kings* and *Princes* of the *World*. Therefore they cannot be Necessary to her *Constitution*, without whom she subsisted for 300 years, before there was any *Christian King* upon the Earth. Or will any say, That the *Frame* of the *Church* was not *Perfect*, before that Time when the most visible *Corruptions* came in upon her ; and since which, she has grown *Worse* and *Worse* ? And, which is *Worst* of all, while under the *Regale* of *Popes*, and *Princes*, and *Dis-Arm'd* of those *Inherent Powers* with which *Christ* did *Invest* her, she knows not how to Help her self : Nor can Exercise her *Discipline*, but under the *Direction* of *Worldly Politicks*, or Mere *Humour* of those who have her in *Subjection*.

All the *World* knows, That the *Regale* was not the *Primitive Frame* of the *Church*. It cou'd not

be before there were *Christian Kings*. Therefore this Learned *Bishop* could never be capable of so *Crude* an Expression as that which next follows in this Speech, viz. *Our Legal Establishment founded upon the PRIMITIVE Pattern*. Nor would he call this, *The true Measure of our Church*; And that those who Rise above it, are as much out of the way, as those who Fall below it. This implies that the *Regale* was always at one Stay, at least since the *Reformation*. For if it be not *Fix'd* and *Settled* it self, how shall we know to keep so to it, as not to Rise above it, or Fall below it? Otherwise, that may be *Above* or *Below* it at one time, which is not so at another. Now no Man in the Nation can know better than my Lord *Bishop*, who wrote that Excellent *History of the Reformation*, how much the *Regale* has alter'd since that Time. The *Title of Head of the Church*. The King's *Vice Gerent in Ecclesiasticals*. The *Bishops* holding during the *Kings Pleasure*. The *Ecclesiastical Commission*. And several other things, then set up, and Highly in *Vogue* are now *Dead* and *Gone*, and *Exploded* by every body. These are *Reformations from the Reformation*. And indeed the Truth is, That the *English Divines* have been *Explaining* away the *Regale*, ever since the first *Heat of the Reformation*. As you may see among many others in *The Subject of Church Power in whom it Resides, &c.* By that Learned Divine Dr. *Simon Louth*, Chap. vi. Printed 1685. very well known

known to the *Bishop*. So that this is no *New* or *Revolution* Doctrine. And his *Lordship* has well Instructed Us in his *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation*, Printed 1688, p. 18, 19, &c. what stress to lay upon some *Flourishes* and *Streatches* in *Acts of Parliament*, that seem to favour the *Regale*.

But the *Author* Nam'd, and the *Book* Meant in this *Speech* Endeavours (*Seet. ix.*) to Solve the *Objections* from our *Laws* and *Acts of Parliament* since the *Reformation*. in a *Milder* strain, without giving them any *Hard Words*, or putting them off as *Flourishes*. And where he Opposes the Opinion of others. he Studiously avoids *Personal Reflections* or any thing that may *Provoke*, other than Pursuing his Argument Plainly, and with as much *Force* as he can.

Therefore if the *Bishop* had made that *Speech*, we Cannot suppose that *Author* could have been Meant in the Excuse his *Lordship* is made to give for himself and other *Bishops*. thus, *The Station we are in, sets us above the Answering every Spiteful Writer*. And the Common Agent both for *PAPISTS* and *JACOBITES* in Distress (as his *Lordship* is call'd in this *Speech*) And he who (as there is said) *Pleaded with so much vehemence, for Excusing the Depriv'd Bishops from the Oaths : And Protesting, That how hardly soever he may be Treated by others, he shall never Treat any Hardly in matters of Conscience*. May such a Man as this could

not have born so *Hard* upon the *Depriv'd*, as this *Speech* do's, p. 4. Where they are Represented as *Enemies to the Government, who deny the Queen's Title, and are looking to one beyond Sea*. And adds, *Can any think that those who Separate from our Church, and have Rais'd a Schism in it, can be Zealous for the Peace and Order of the Church?* If his Lordship had thought so, he would have *Voted* for the *Bill*, to keep such *Schismaticks* out of *Places of Power and Trust*, that they might not *Hurt the Church?* And if no body Look'd *beyond Sea*, but those here *Accus'd*, I believe her *Majesty* wou'd have less *Trouble* upon the *Throne*. And which of these have most Reason to wish well to her, and do in good Earnest *Pray* for her *Life and Preservation*, I leave it to the *Bishop* himself to *Determine*.

But do not they Love the *Church*, who *Suffer* for her, and *Write* for her; and the *Chief*, and indeed *Only* Objection against them, is, That they wou'd Raise her too *High*? Whence the *Opprobrious* name (as it is thought) of *High-Church Men* and *High-Fliers* is Given to them; And even that of *Popishly Affected* too, to help out the *Cry*, and *Mark* them out for the *Mobb*! Tho' that Charge cannot be laid upon any one of them, that I ever heard of, with the least *Colour* or *Pretence*. And several of them have Employ'd their *Pens* against *Popery*. Even the *Author* here *Struck* at, and in the same *Book* Objected to, has *Attack'd Rome* in the
Ten-

Tendrest part, that of her *Supremacy*. He has indeed Propos'd *Terms of Union*, whereby to restore *Catholick Communion*. But what are they? Every one of them is for their Coming to Us, not we to them. For them to Quit their *Errors*, not that we shou'd go over to them. And what *Christian* wou'd not wish a *Reconciliation* upon these *Terms*? All would, except those *Politicians* who make use of the word *Popery* to serve their *Designs*, to *Enflame* and to *Rebel*! Who *Practice* the *Principles of Popery*, while they *Cry-out* against it! Who think it *Lawful* to *Lye for God*, and *Serve Him by Breaking his Commandments*! This others Dare not venture upon. And think it the *Likest* way to bring in *Popery*, by *Provoking God* against Us. Who wants not our *Virtues* to help *Him* to *Govern the World*, much less our *Vices*. And whoever Preach *Trusting* any thing to *Providence*, and the Containing Men within the *Bounds* of their *Duty*, are Reckon'd *Disaffected*. It is Meer *Cant* in our *Politicks*. So that let a Man *Write* against all the *Errors* of *Popery*, and let him take all the Pains he can, to bring others over from them; and for this Suffer the *Persecution* of the *Tongue* from them (as well as from others) and be call'd an *Arch-Heretick* by them, as I have seen in *Letters* concerning that same *Author*, as well as heard their *Reproaches* of him, for his *Opposition* to them; yet all this Notwithstanding, he must be a *Papist*, he shall be a *Papist*! While he stands out against
that

that *Papish* Principle, of a Good *End* Sanctifying the most *Wicked Means*. And Blames it in *Presbyterians* or *Others*, who think we may do any thing for the *Good* of *Mother Church*, to *Lye*, *Betray*, *Swear*, and *For-Swear*, to *Murder*, and *Depose* their *Kings*, for the *Good* of *Religion*! What can he be but a *Papist*, who Talks at this Rate! And if we had a *Worse Word* to Throw at him, he shou'd have it. This he took no Notice of in several Poor *Pamphlets* that *Bark'd* at him. But seeing it again Repeated in what bears the *Name* of my *Lord Bishop* of *Salisbury*, he said it must be an *Abuse* put upon his *Lordship*, for that it was Impossible he shou'd fall into that *Mistake*, for two Reasons, *First*, Because it was *Senseless*; And *Secondly*. Very *Malicious*. Therefore I have taken this Pains to *Vindicate* his *Lordship* from the *Imputation* of that *Speech*. Considering that his *High Station*, sets him *Above* answering every *spiteful Writer*. And who wou'd Believe, That he who so *Charitably* and *Vehemently* Plead'd for *Excusing* the *Depriv'd* from the *Oaths* shou'd afterwards have them *Hunted to Death* for not *Taking* them!

4. A *Fourth Reason* given against the *Bill*, in the *8th. Paragraph* of this *Speech*, is, That the *Dissenters* may apprehend the *Toleration* is Aim'd at. That it be not Mention'd, or any thing like it. And that *The next step* may be for their *Wives and Children*. For which this Reason is produc'd. If one Packs at a great *Dike* that keep out the *Sea* it will

will be thought, how small a Breach soever he makes at first that he Designs a total Inundation. ---- So Men will grow Jealous, and be on their Guard.

I say the *Bishop* could not Argue at this Rate against the *Bill*, because it makes Men strongly for it. For has not the *Government* as much Reason to be *Jealous*, and stand upon their *Guard*, when they see the *Dissenters* from the *Establishment* Picking at our *Dikes*; and grown already so *Rampant* as to *Dispute* it with us in *Parliament*? That they will not be Content with a Full and True *Toleration*, but must be in *Power* too. Tho' they will Allow of no *Toleration* to the *Church*, where they have *Power*, as in *Scotland*. Must every body be *Jealous* but the *Government*!

And as for the Cry of *Wives* and *Children*, it is Highly *Seditious*, and ought to put the *Government* more upon their *Guard*. At this Rate, no *Law* can be made to Restrain any sort of People, in any manner of thing, but they may presently Cry up to *Arms*, and say, The *Design* is against our *Lives*, our *Wives* and *Children*! And in the present *Case*, the *Cause* still Remains tho' the *Bill* be *Rejected* For the *Commons* Voted it And may Carry it another time. And what *Security* can the *Dissenters* have? Can any *Party* have, who are not of the *Church Established* in any *Country*? Why truly none at all but to have the Whole *Power* put into their own hands. How otherwise can they be *Secure*? All *Subjects* are in the *Power*
of

of every *Government*. And to Ask *Security* against it, is neither more nor less, than a Pretence of *Rebellion*. For no *Security* can be Given, but a total over-throw of the *Government*, and putting it into the Hands of those, who have *Jealousies* and *Fears*, which Cannot otherwise be *Cured* ! To Sap the *Foundations* of a *Government* has been heard of. But I believe this is the first time, That *Dissenters* from the *Legal Establishment*, ever put Themselves so upon the *Level* with the *Government*, as to Talk of the *Government* sapping their *Foundations*, or *Picking* at their *Dikes* !

And that for no Greater a Cause, than when they Enjoy a Full and Free *Toleration*, to say, it may be taken from them ; and that they Cannot be *Secure*, nor will Rest *Satisfy'd*, unless they are Admitted into *Places* of *Power* and *Trust* in the *Government*, thereby to *Secure* themselves !

But of all Men the *Bishop* of *Sarum* Cou'd not Advance such an *Argument* as this, who is *Naturaliz'd* in *Holland*, and so well Understands their *Constitution* ; whereby tho' the *Dissenters* from the *Church Establish'd*, are Allow'd a *Toleration*, as to *Religion* ; yet they are not Admitted into their *Parliament*, or *Magistracy*. And if they shou'd set up such *Pleas* for it, as our *Dissenters* do here, his Lordship is sensible, That the very *Toleration* they now Enjoy, wou'd soon be taken from them, if the *States* shou'd once Perceive such use to be made of it, as thereby to Thrust themselves into the *Government*. His

His Lordship was in *Holland* when *Pentitioner Fagel* wrote that *Letter* (which was *Printed*) in Answer to *Mr. James Stuart*, a little before the *Revolution*; where he Clears his Highness the *Prince of Orange* from the *Insinuation*, as if he Intended or wou'd Endeavour to bring the *Dissenters* in *England* into *Places*; But declar'd that he Meant no more, than to support that *Toleration*, as to *Religion*, which they then Enjoy'd from *K. James*. And were very Thankful for it.

Now the *Bishop* who was in the *Secret* when this *Letter* was wrote, and knew the *Pretensions* then set up, wou'd never run so *Counter* to them, and let the *World* know that they were not *Sincerely* Meant, as by Arguing on the *Contrary* side in this *Speech*. He cou'd not do it, who never Alter'd his *Sentiments*, and can Defie the Worst *Enemy* he has to Instance any *one step* of his *Life*, wherein he *Prevaricated* the least Tittle; or Acted not always *Openly* and *above Board* for the *Church*, and against the *Dissenters*.

And *King William* did so far perform what *Pentitioner Fagel* promis'd in his Name, that he left the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts* in full force. And no doubt with the Consent of the *Bishop*, who as this *Speech* says, *Knew somewhat of Affairs in the last Reign*.

And his Lordship knows well, That no new *Severity*, was intended against the *Dissenters* by this *Bill*, but only to Secure the former *Corporati-*

on and *Test-A&T*s which they had found *Jesuitical Methods of Eluding* to the *Scandal of Christianity*.

In Answer to this, it is offer'd in the 6th Paragraph of this *Speech*, p. 3. That the Lord *Clifford* got some to Move for a Clause in favour of the *Dissenters*, in the *Test-A&T*. And that it was Stopt by Alderman LOVE, &c.

This the *Bishop* could not say, for he knows the Matter of Fact to be otherwise. As to that of Lord *Clifford*, let it pass among the *Secrets*, with which this *Speech* Answers Arguments. And it matters not whether it be True or False. For what is it against the Authority of an *A&T* of *Parliament*, who Mov'd it ; or if some body got some body to Speak for or against it ?

But as to Alderman Love, and the *Dissenters* Part in it, it was thus ; They had not a mind to have their *Toleration* stand upon the Foot of the *King's* Dispensing Power. First, Because they are no Friends of *Prerogative*. And Secondly, They thought it Surer to have it by *A&T* of *Parliament*, and they heartily Endeavour'd it, contrary to what this *Speech* says, against all Probability of Truth. That they would not so much as Accept of it ; and that Alderman Love did stop the Clause in favour of the *Dissenters*, which Lord *Clifford* got some to move.

Whereas

Whereas Alderman *Love* did himself move in the *House of Commons*, That they wou'd open their Doors Wider, to let in *Protestant Dissenters*, who were willing to Come in upon Reasonable *Terms*. The *House* Receiv'd the *Motion* very Readily, and gave Alderman *Love* a Fortnights time, to know what *Terms* the *Dissenters* wou'd Propose. And the *Alderman* having Try'd, made his Report, very Frankly, That truly they cou'd Agree to no *Terms*, for that what one *Lik'd*, another *Oppos'd*, &c.

And this is the Reason why, as this *Speech* says, (but gives not this, or any other Reason) That little Progress was indeed made, in the Bill order'd to be brought in for the Ease of *Protestant Dissenters*. For who can Please them who cannot agree among themselves, what will Content them? That is they will not tell the Secret, that their Aim being to Gain the whole Power, both in Church and State to themselves, they must never tell what will Reconcile them, but always keep up a Pretence of Quarrel. And many Well-Meaning-Men, as Alderman *Love*, &c. are Deceiv'd in their Pretences to Conscience, while Empire is their Design.

And as many as have Try'd them, have found it so. They have been often Provok'd, both by Publick Authority, and in several Discourses in Print, to Name the Particulars, which if Granted, wou'd Reconcile them. And they can never be

brought to it. But keep off in *Generals*, and Plead *Tender Consciences*, without *Limitation*.

Alderman *Love* then Declar'd, that the *Dissenters* Desir'd no more than a Bare *Tolaration*, to serve *God* according to their *Consciences*. But some time after, when things look'd more Favourably towards the *Dissenters*, the same Alderman *Love* Mov'd for their being Restor'd to their *Birth-Rights*, and the Privilege of *English Men*, to Enjoy *Places* and *Preferments*. Upon which Sir *Thomas Clarges*, who was very Intimate with him, and had gone along with him in the former Motion for a *Tolaration*, told him this Contradicted what he had Affirm'd before in the *House*, That the *Dissenters* Aim'd at no more than a *Tolaration*; the *Alderman* Reply'd, But our *Party* is *Stronger* now than it was Then.

They are for *Inching*. And if you Give it them, will take an *Ell*. They are not now Content with the Throwing out this *Bill*; but they would Explain away the *Corporation* and *Test Acts*, as this *Speech* Endeavours. And by the *Arguments* advanc'd in it, the *Question* is now with them, not whether they will be *Allarm'd* at *New Acts* made against them?

But whether they will not be as much *Allarm'd* if our *Old Laws* are Maintain'd? And will not Call this, *Picking* at their *Dikes*; and *The next step will be for their Wives and Children, &c!* They pretend to be Afraid of what the *Government* will do.

do. Tho' they have all the *Security* the *Government* can Give them, that no such thing is Intended. The *Queen* has Repeated her *Assurance* from the *Throne*, that she will Maintain their *Toleration*. And both the *Lords* and *Commons*, who Voted for this *Bill*, have said the same.

Now what other *Security* wou'd they have ? Suppose an *Act* of *Parliament* were *Pass'd* for it. Wou'd that be any more than the *Act* they have for it already ? For who knows not that an *Act* of *Parliament* may be *Repeal'd* ? Therefore when Men Ask a *Security* that is *Impossible* to be given; and, at the same time, Declare that they will not take the *Queen's Word*, nor that of *All* the *Lords* and *Commons* (who are *Nemine Contradicente* for the *Toleration*) it is Easie to Guess what sort of *Security* they wou'd be at ! Even to put it out of the *Power* of *Queen* *Lords* or *Commons* to *Hurt* them ! For which there is but one way in the *World*, that is, to take the *Power* into their *own* hands.

But at the same time that they Declare such open *Distrust* of the *Faith* of the *Government*, and will not Rest satisfy'd with its *Promises* to them ; They take it most *Heinously*, if any Suggest the Least *Suspicion* of their Good *Intentions*, tho' without their *Promises* (for none such have they Given) or wou'd mind them of their *Former* Doings ; or have the *Government* be upon its *Guard*, or have the least *Eye* towards *Them* ; tho' they

they are not only *Picking* at our *Dicks*, but have set their *Pioneers* to Work at Noon-Day, in *Parliament*, *Press*, and *Pulpit*.

But if any take Notice of this, tho' never so Apparent they are Immediately *Branded* with the Name of *High-Allies*, Men of no *Moderation*, *Spiteful Writers*, nay *Papists* and *Jacobites*! And no other Answer is Given to *Demonstration* and plain *Fact*. For none other can be Given.

But tho' they Trust not *Promises* (knowing of what *Weight* their own are) yet they love to have them *Repeated* often, that they may *Cavil* at them, and see what *Holes* they can Pick in them. Nay, if they are not *Repeated* and *Repeated* where there is no Occasion for them, this will be made a *Positive Argument*, that they were never sincerely Intended. Thus in the *Occasional Bill* brought in last year, there was a *Preamble* fortifying the *Act* of *Toleration*. Which was of no other use than to shew that the *Commons* did not Intend to Invade that *Act*. For an *Act* of *Parliament* is of Force, till it be *Repeal'd*. And 100 Confirmations of it, add no strength to it. Therefore it was not Repeated in the *Bill* brought in last *Session*. Now see what use is made of this. The *Speech* says *Paragr. 18. p. 7. They* (the words in favour of *Toleration*) *are now left out, with great Sincerity, no doubt, for those who do not Intend to Maintain the Toleration, act a very Honest part when they will not Profess it.* This is a Downright *Arraigning* the
the

the whole *House of Commons* of the utmost *Perfidie* and *Disimulation*. As if they had never *Intended* what they so Solemnly *Profess'd* in favour of *Toleration*. For it was the same *House of Commons* that brought in both *Bills*. And speaking of the first *Bill*, wherein that *Preamble* was, their *Sincerity* therein is Compar'd to that of the *Inquisition*, which Delivers *Hereticks* to be *Burnt*, with an *Abjuration* that no *Harm* be done them. This is a *Decent Treatment* of the Honourable *House of Commons* and *Representative* of the *Nation*! And shews with what *Sincerity* the Omission of this *Preamble* in the *second Bill* is Quarrel'd, when we see what use they make of it in the *first*.

And it likewise Teaches us, how *Feasible* it is, to seek to *Pleaze* these Men. *Promise* or not *Promise* it is all one! They can *Cavil* on both Sides! And if their *Toleration* was Invaded, they could *Quarrel* no more than they do. They have given all the *Provocations* to it that is *Possible*. While they have made it Apparent that it is *Impossible* to *Pleaze* them; with less than the Total overthrow of both *Church* and *State*, and having the whole *Reigns of Government* put into their own Hands. And which they must have, if they be Suffer'd to go on, as they have begun.

And can we suppose, that the *Bishop of Sarum* is in the *Secret* of Driving on such a Design? And was this too with a Prospect *Beyond Sea*?

But if any *Stress* was laid upon the *Preamble* omitted in the *second Bill*, it might have been easily Added by the *Lords*, and the *Commons*, we may suppose, wou'd not have been against it. That the *Speech* owns, and says, *Paragr. 19. p. 7. I know it may be said, Let us put in these words, and stand to them. But (Answers) still this will not lay the Apprehensions that the leaving out these Words must Raise.* That is, the Party did not Care for the *Words*, whether they were put into the *Bill*, or not. But being Resolv'd to Raise *Apprehensions*, and *Enflame*, they wou'd not Lose the *Opportunity* ! They wou'd not Accept of the *Words* now ; it is Enough that they were once left out ! How *Agreeable* was this, to the Large *Professions* made in the *Preamble* of this *Speech*, to follow the *Admonition* given to both *Houses* from the *Throne*, to Preserve *Peace* and *Union* among themselves ? But this Reason given in this *Speech*, for Rejecting that *Bill*, is directly Picking a *Quarrel*. And Resolving not to be *Satisfied*. How frequent are *Additions*, *Amendments*, *Alterations* in *Bills* by either *House*, and often *Agreed* to, by *Conferences* with each other ? But to say, as this *Speech* do's, we know you will *Agree* therefore we will not *Propose* it, is the first time ever such a Reason was given for Rejecting a *Bill*. And to *Bate* the *House* of *Commons* for this, and Try to *Expose* them to the *Nation* ! Such a *Proceeding*, such *Arguing* as this, could never befall the Lord *Bishop* of *Sarum* ! It looks more like *Legion*. And

And so do's what next follows, *Paragr.* 26. p. 7, 8. Which puts this Construction upon the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts*, that tho' they Requir'd all Men in Places, to be *in the Communion of the Church*, yet it was not Intended, *they shou'd always Continue to be so*. What ! Was it only the Pleasure to see these Mens Faces once at Church, for which these *Acts* were Made? Or, was it, That *Employments* were not thought fit to be Entrusted in any Hands but of those who were in the *Communion of the Church*? This *Speech* argues, *Parag.* 6. p. 3. That these *Acts* were intended *Only* against the *Papists*. And that *it wou'd be hard to turn them against the other Dissenters*. And was it then Intended that a *Papist* shou'd only make his Appearance *once or so at Church*, to *Qualify* himself for a Place, and Return next Day *Openly* and *Bare fac'd to Mass* ! Sure the *Bishop* wou'd not put such *Childrens play* upon the *Wisdom of the Nation* ! And this *Construction* here put upon these *Acts* must either hold good for the *Papists*, or be of no use to the other *Dissenters*. Unless it be said, That instead of these *Acts* being made only against the *Papists*, and that the other *Dissenters* are not *Included*: You turn the Tables, and now say, That the *Papists* are not *Included* ; and that these *Acts* were made only against the *Protestant Dissenters* ! Otherwise this *Pritty Construction* of these *Acts*, will look as *Invidious* as it is *Ridiculous*.

V. After all the violent *Invectives* against the *Bill of Occasional Conformity* which are in this *Speech*, and making the Like a *Blemish* to all former *Reigns*, who can Believe that the *Bishop* would make such a *Contradictory Conclusion*, as this *Speech* ends with, *Parag. 22. p. 8.* As for the *Enacting part*, when in a proper *Time* a *Bill* shall be brought in, *Disabling all to hold any Employment*, except those who continue to be in the *Communion of the Church of England*, I shall concur in it heartily.

First, here is not only *Occasional Conformity* to the *Church*, but continue to be, a constant *Conformity* made the *Condition*.

And will not that be a *Blemish* in one *Reign*, as well as in *Another*? Will not the same *Pretences* lie of *Invading Toleration, Wives, Children, &c.* as Now.

We must therefore Suppose, that this *Speech-Maker* has some other *Reign* in view, when such a *Moderate Episcopacy* will be set up, as that the *Dissenters* from it will Deserve no *Quarter*, no *Toleration*; but be *Hunted and Persecuted*, as the *Church* now in *Scotland*. He tells us there is a proper *Time* coming, when he will concur in it Heartily. And then it will be no Breach of *Moderation*!

VI. Who can suppose him Guilty of such an *Un-Guarded Expression*, and Savouring of *Popery*, as, speaking of my *Lord's Grace of Canterbury*,
(*Paragr.*

(Paragr. 12. p. 5.) to call him *The Head of our Order*. The *Head of Bishops* is none but *Christ*. The *Pope* being *Flatter'd* with this *Title*, took it to himself. And built his *Supremacy* upon it. But we have Justly taken it from him ; and our own *Princes* have given it up, as too *Great* for any *Mortal*, as before Quoted from my Lord of *Sarum*. Therefore this might have been put upon any rather than upon his *Lordship*. He will never be the *First* to set up a *Head of Bishops*, or *Popery* in *England*.

He who is so Strenuous an Asserter of the *Liberty* and *Property* of the *People*, as to *Civil* Affairs ; wou'd not Betray the *Church*, to put her under the *Despotick* Sway of an *Alterius Orbis Papa*, to give him Power to Deprive all the *Bishops* in the Kingdom, by own single Authority, as being *Head* of their *Order*.

And when he had done, to say, as this *Speech* makes him, p. 4. *Paragr*, 11. *I know no High Church but the Church of Rome*. This is like another Printed *Speech* I have seen, which was put upon another Noble *Peer*, who Arguing upon the Point of the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, in the former *Revolution* of *Forty-One*, said, *I think there is nothing Jure Divino, but God*.

But what cou'd the *Bishop* mean here by *High-Church* ? He cou'd not Mean *High* in *Riches* and outward *Grandure*. That is too *Trifling* for the *Bishop*, and a *Burlesking* his *Lordship*. And if

High in Authority be meant, his *Lordship* knows very well, that the *Pope of Rome*, never Exercis'd a Greater *Authority* over his *Colleagues* the *Bishops* within his Jurisdiction, than to *Deprive* them. And I believe he wou'd be Fuzled to find an Instance where the *Pope* did *Deprive* any *Bishop*, by his own single *Authority*, without such a *Bishop* being Judg'd by other *Bishops*.

It was Decreed in the *Council of Carthage*, A. D. 348. *Can. xi.* That a *Bishop* shou'd not be Try'd by less than *Twelve Bishops*. And the *Council* held there, A. D. 419. *Can. xii.* Confirms the same, if more *Bishops* cou'd not be had.

And when a *Bishop* was *Depriv'd* by *Twelve*, or as many *Bishops* as cou'd be got together, they were to Report the *Whole Cause*, with their *Proceedings*, to the other *Bishops* every where, that the Concurrence of the whole *Episcopal Collegue* might be had. Which method we find Exactly pursu'd in the Deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus*. *Euseb. Hist. L. vii. C. 30.*

The Great St. *Cyprian* Arch-Bishop of *Carthage*, at a *Council* held there, wherein he Presided, did Declare, That he took not upon him to be *Bishop* or *Head of Bishops*, every *Bishop* there having the same *Authority* in his own *Diocefs*, as he had in his, and the same *Liberty* to Differ from him in Judgment, as he from any of them; Each of them being Answerable to *Christ* the *Chief Shepherd*, for that Portion of his *Flock* committed to his Charge

Charge. St. Cyprian pretended to no more than, according to the Stated *Discipline* at that Time, to be *Præses* or *Speaker* of the *Council*.

But to be *Head* and *Sovereign* over other *Bishops*, is what long after St. Cyprian's time, Gregory the Great Blaim'd in John then *Arch-Bishop* of *Constantinople*; and fore-told the Times of *Anti-Christ* a coming, when one *Bishop* did set himself so Above his *Colleagues* and *Fellow-Bishops*, as that he must *Judge* of them, but not they of him. No man knows these things better than my Lord of *Sarum*. And that according to the *Discipline* of the *Primitive Church*, *Arch Bishops* were *Deposable*. How is it then Possible, that he shou'd set up such a *Head* of *Bishops* in *England*, as is not *Deposable* by all the other *Bishops*, but every one of them *Deposable* by him?

And how could he give the Name of *High-Church* to these who Oppose this *Absolute* and *Super-Papal Supremacy*, in the Hands of one *Person*; And wou'd have things Reduc'd to a more *Moderate*, and the *Primitive Frame*?

How cou'd he Charge *Distinction* of *High-Church*, and *Low-Church*, upon those here Call'd the *High-Church*, who find fault with the *Distinction*, and shew it to have been set up by the *Whiggs* and *Dissenters*, to *Divide* and *Blacken* the *Church of England*; and to have opportunity, under the Name of the *High-Church*, to vent all their *Venom* against the *Church* in General, her

Liturgie,

Liturgy, Rites, and Ceremonies, and whole Oeconomy?

Such Gross Mistakes as these, cou'd not Fall from the *Bishop of Sarum*.

VII. His Natural *Modesty* wou'd not let his own *Mouth* be the *Trumpet* of his Just *Praises*, as to tell how he, of all Men, least Deserv'd to be *ill Treated* by any body, and to say (Parag. 13. p. 5.) *In no one step or part of my Life, I ever gave the least occasion for it----- I had the Thanks of this House for my History of the Reformation----- Which was Wrote with an Honesty and Zeal that ought to set me beyond Suspicion. But I own I began the World on a Principle of Moderation, which I have carry'd down through my whole Life. And Parag. 12. We have in the whole course of our Lives adhered to the Interest of the Church, at all Perils, and in all Times, without ever once, in any particular, leaning to the Dissenters. And Parag. 3. We are so well known, and have liv'd so Long in a Publick Scene, and have Acted such a Part on it, that we may Reckon our selves above Calumnies. Even St. Paul said, He became a Fool in Glorifying; but it was when others compell'd him to it. Cou'd any thing have Compell'd the Bishop of Sarum to Compare Glorifying with St. Paul? Did he ever think himself Caught up to the third Heaven?*

But he says, (*ibid.*) *We are the Disciples of the Cross. And no Man has Preach'd it more than his Lordship: Or Pres'd Passive Obedience to a greater Height.*

Height. Or kept *Truer* to it, or *Suffer'd* more for it, in every *Step* and *Turn* of his *Life*. Now tho' all this be most *Exactly* so, yet his *Lordship* wou'd never have become such a *Fool*, in *Glorying*, as to give the *Detail* of it thus himself. And where there was no need of it, in the *House* of *Lords*, who were all *Witnesses* of it.

VIII. He could never have had the *Vanity* to Thrust himself into all *Secrets* of *State*, even before he was *in the Publick Scene*, and had *Acted* such a *Part* on it, in the Reign of King *Charles II.* when he was not over much *Trusted*, as to say what is before *Quoted*, That such a thing *Will Amaze* all that do not know the *Secret* of that time. And in the next *Parag.* to tell a *Secret* of that time; which is *Publickly* known to be otherwise, as that the Lord *Stafford* told me (says *Speech*) *in the Tower* of an *Oath* of *Secresy*, tender'd by the *Earl* of *Bristol* to a *Meeting* of *Papists*, &c. Was *Dr. Burnet* then *Confessor* to the Lord *Stafford*? Or wou'd he *Reveal* it? Was he *Employ'd* by the *Government* to *Examine* him? Or was he a very particular *Confidant* of his *Lordship's*, that he shou'd *Entrust* him with such an *Important Secret*? Wou'd he *Boast* of this *Now*, as if he were in all *Secrets*?

But it is *Added* in the *Speech*; That he (Lord *Stafford*) *told it likewise* at the *Bar* of this *House*. My Lord of *Sarum* was not then a *Member* of that *House*. Nor then present. And those *Lords* who were *Present* at the Lord *Stafford's* *Examination*,

nation, say the Quite contrary, that Lord *Stafford* did not tell any such thing at that *Bar*. There is nothing of it in the *Journals* of the *House of Lords*. And it is Probable that an *Oath* of *Secresy* among the *Papists*, at that time of Day, in the Height of the *Popish Plot*, and Attested by the Lord *Stafford*, wou'd have been thought so Considerable, as, at least, to be *Mention'd*, and not totally *Forgotten*. And my Lord of *Sarum* (who has Access to the *Journals* of the *House*) cou'd not but Know all this ; and wou'd not have *Affronted* himself, and Sought to *Impose* upon the *House of Lords*, by *Asserting*, what he cou'd not *Prove*.

But Looking into that *Journal* upon this Occasion, there is a Passage in it, which has some Relation to the late Dispute betwixt the *House of Lords* and *Commons*, concerning the Power of the *Lords*, by their own Authority, to send for *Prisoners of State*; to be *Examined* by them, and *Committed* to other *Prisons*, if they thought fit. In which I will by no Means take upon me to Determine; only set down what the *Journal* says in that Case of the Lord *Stafford*, viz. That he was *Condemned* the 7th. of *December*, 1680. And the 18th. of the same *December*, The *Earl of Carlile* acquainted the *House* that the Lord *Stafford* wou'd make a Confession of what he knew concerning the *Plot*, and desir'd he migh be brought to the *Bar* of that *House*. The *House* hereupon appointed an *Address* should be made to his *Majesty*, that he wou'd
please

please to give leave for the bringing the said late Viscount *Stafford* to this House. And the *King* having been Attended with the *Address*, and giving *Leave*, the Lord *Stafford* was sent for. And in the *Order* to the *Lieutenant* of the *Tower*, to bring him; it is Express'd that they did it, by *Leave and consent of his Majesty*. Here the *Lords* did not think fit, without the *King's* Express *Leave and Consent* first *Ask'd* and *Obtain'd*, to *Send* for, or *Examine*, upon the Head of a *Plot*, one of their own *Members*, and so more Intirely in their Power; And in the next place, one already *Condemned* to *Dye*, and so out of any *Protection* at all. But to Return to our *Speech*.

IX. In *Paragr. 7. p. 3.* He says, *In the end of King Charles II. Reign we all Remember that a new Prosecution of them (the Dissenters) was set on foot; and even then, when the Severities against them were very hard, they were Solicited by the Agents of the Court, to Petition for a General Toleration, but they could not be Prevail'd on.*

But there was a better Reason for their not *Petitioning*, that is, the Improbability of having it Granted. They had then been Palpably *Detected* in several *Conspiracies* to *Murther* the *King*, at the *Rye-House*, at the *Oxford Parliament*, &c. for which they were then under *Prosecution*, and some of them *Suffer'd* for it. Was this a *Time* were these good *Arguments* to *Sue* for a *Toleration*, when the *King* was not secure of his *Life* one *Day*, from
G their

their Attempts! And is it likely the *King* wou'd Employ *Agents* to Move them to *Ask*, what we must believe, in Common sense, he was Resolv'd not to *Grant* them? But this is Another of this *Speecher's* SECRETS.

But the *Bishop of Sarum* wou'd not have Mention'd these *Severities* as they are call'd) and said, that they *were very hard*, without telling the *Occasion* of them, and what *Forc'd* the *King* to them. Such an *Impratial Historian* wou'd not tell the Tale all on one side, to lay the *Odium* where it was not due.

And he wou'd not *Molifie* as much on the other hand, as is done in the next Words, *What some of them did in King James's Reign is well known, and cannot be Excused*. That is, in *Accepting* (what they never Refus'd) a *Toleration*, and their *Mighty Applauses*, and *Addresses* full of *Loyalty* upon that Occasion. But this is here put only upon *Some* of them, *What some of them did*. Whereas it was the whole *Body* or *Bodies* of them, all their *Meetings*, every where through *England*, as well as *Scotland* and *Ireland*. And if there were *Any* or *Some* who did not Approve it, they did not *Appear*, they were not *Known*. They must be put among the *Secrets* of this *Writer* !

X. The Learned *Bishop of Sarum* cou'd not Talk so Loosely of the *Church* and of *Communion* as this *Speech* do's, *Paragr. 15*, and *16. p. 6.* where the *Writer* makes *Episcopacy* not to be *Necessary*
to

to the *Constitution of a Church*, Contrary to the Bishop's *Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland*, against the *Presbyterians* there.

If *Episcopacy* is not *Necessary*, if it is not of *Divine* and *Apostolical* Institution, if it may be *Dispens'd* with, then *Down* with it. It is a *Bone of Contention*. And an *Infraction* among the *Reform'd*.

But whatever *Allowance* is to be made in Cases of *Necessity*, for those who cannot have *Episcopacy*, if any such there be. Yet it is not the same, with those who *Rebel* against *Episcopacy* and *Separate* from their own Lawful *Bishops*, where nothing *Sinful* is *Requir'd* as a *Condition of Communion*. If this be not *Schism*, there never was any. Nor can be. And the *Bishop of Sarum* is neither so *Ignorant* or *Enthusiastical* as to think that our *Dissenters* are not formally *Schismatics*; and therefore, that *Communion* with them is not utterly *Unlawful*, and *Involving* us in their *Schism*.

And as to the *Foreign Reformed*, we know that our Learned *Bishops* and *Divines* who were *Forc'd* Abroad in the former *Revolution*, did *Refuse* to *Communicate* with them. As *Dr. Bramhal*, Lord *Bishop* of *Derry* after Lord *Primate* of *Ireland* *Dr. Morley* after Lord *Bishop* of *Winchester*, *Dr. Creighton* after *Bishop* of *Bath and Wells*, *Dr. Earl* after *Bishop* of *Salisbury*, *Dr. Stuart*, &c. And after the *Restoration*, by the *Act of Uniformity* their *Ordinations* were so far *Declar'd Null*, that if any

of their *Ministers* (as well as those among our selves) shou'd come over to our *Church*, they were Accounted but as *Lay-Men*, till they were *Ordain'd* by *Bishops*.

This matter was Debated by our *Divines* with the Reformed *Ministers* Abroad; who took it *Heinously* that they Refus'd *Communion* with them. There is in *Print* a Letter from the Learned and Ingenious Mr. *Bouchart*, to the then Dr. *Morley* before Mention'd, upon this Subject. But our *Divines* Asserted the *Divine* Right and *Necessity* of *Episcopacy* and *Ordination* by *Bishops*.

Now suppose that the *Bishop* of *Sarum* had a Greater *Latitude* than our *English Divines*, which ought not to be suppos'd, because he was a *Strenuous Asserter* of *Episcopacy*, and a *Writer* for it in *Scotland*, which he hath done *Excellently* well : But I say, That if he had Alter'd his Mind, his *Prudence* and his *Modesty* wou'd have found out some other *Argument*, than to Oppose his own *Example* and *Authority* to that of the *Divines* before Mention'd, and the Current of the *Church* of *England*, and not to give this for a Proof as this *Speech* makes him, saying, *I my self was an Occasional Conformist in Geneva and Holland*. And says he will do so again, when he go's thither next time. Thence concludes as a *certainty*, *And so I think an Occasional Conformity, &c. is Justify'd*.

To fortify his own **Example**, there is nothing brought in this *Speech*, but a *Passage* (which is not Quoted) of a *Noble Historian*, who, he says, *finds great fault with those who did not go to the French Churches*. Yet that *Noble Historian* did not go himself, tho' he *Dy'd* there. And there is yet in being a *Discourse* wrote with his own hand, which I have seen, shewing his *Reasons* why he cou'd not *Communicate* with them. And I am told by a good hand, when he was *Sick at Montpelier*, an *Apothecary* was sent for to him, who *Pressing* his *Lordship* to more than *Ordinary* hast to *Dispatch* him, gave for *Excuse*, that as soon as he had done with his *Lordship*, he was to lay on his *Hands* at an *Ordination* (he being a *Lay-Elder*) and that the *Company* staid for him. His *Lordship* was *Struck* with *Astonishment*, to see how *Vile* the *Holy Orders* were *Prostituted*. And us'd to say, can any *Believe* that the *Character* of a *Minister of Christ* is *Convey'd* by such *Mechanicks*? So that this was an *unlucky Second* found out for the *Bishop* upon this *Point*.

A *Reverend* and *Worthy Divine* told me, That about 30 years ago, *Monfieur Claude* the famous *Hugonot Minister*, did *Inveigh* bitterly to him against this same *Noble Historian*, as well as against *Dr. Morley*, and others of our *Divines* there, who *Refus'd* to *Communicate* with the *Hugonots* in *France*.

And as to that Passage in his Lordship's *History*, which I suppose is meant in this *Speech*. Vol. 2. p. 73. &c. his Lordship is there Discourfing purely upon *Politicks*; how useful it was to keep fair with thofe People, and what Services they had done us, as *Spies* in the *Courts* of their own *Princes*. But it feems they cou'd *Play* on both fides. For the *History* tells in the fame place, p. 75. That when the *Rebellion* broke out againft King *Charles I.* their *Malice* to the *Church* made them Enter into the *ſame Conſpiracy* with their *Brethren* the *Presbyterians* here, againft the *Crown*.

But the *Disciples of the Crofs* (of which Number, as this *Speech* Truly ſays, the *Biſhop of Sarum* is, in an Eminent degree, and never Vary'd from it, in any one ſtep, through the whole courſe of his *Life*) do not Govern their *Conſciences* by *Worldly Politicks*; But always make their *Politicks* wholly ſubſervient to *Religion*. And no Man knows better than the *Biſhop*, that the *Church* and *Religion* have Suffer'd more, and been more *Corrupted* in *Doctrine* and *Worſhip*, and loſt the *Simplicity* of the *Gofpel*, by following of theſe ſort of *Politicks*, more than by all the open *Perſecutions* which they have Endur'd.

The *Noble Hiſtorian* blames the *Unſkilfulneſs* of our *Management* of the *Hugonots* in *France*; And thereupon Diſcourſes as a *ſtates-Man*. But as to the *Conſciencious* part, he ſufficiently Guarded, p. 72. before he Enter'd upon the other Subject

Subject of *Politicks*, and with which he Introduceth it, in a most *Pious* and *Christian*, as well as a *Prudent* and *Political* Discourse, against that too common *Artifice* of *Princes*, and *States*, to Foment *Divisions* and *Rebellions* in each others *Countries*. Which he Exposeth, in a very *Pathetical* manner, not only as very *Wicked* before *God*, but *Impolitical* as to Themselves, thereby Teaching their own *Subjects* to *Rebell*. He says, *That the Rebellion of Subjects against their Prince, ought to be look'd upon by all other Kings, as an Assault of their own Sovereignty, and in some Degree, a Design against Monarchy it self; and consequently to be suppress'd and Extirpated, in what other Kingdom soever it is, with the like concernment as if it were in their own Bowels.* And he says, that the *Hugonots* in *France* (with whom this *Crown* heretofore, it may be, kept too much Correspondence) were declar'd *Enemies* to the *King*; and in *Publick*, and in *Secret*, gave all possible Assistance to those whose Business was to Destroy the *Church*. And Prov'd of unspeakable Inconvenience and Damage to the *King*, throughout all these Troubles, and of equal Benefit to his *Enemies*. Having thus fully Declar'd his own Sentiments, with Great Probity and Judgment he goes on to shew the Mismanagements, as to *Politicks*, which happen'd in their Trafficking with these *Hugonots*. Among which was this, of withdrawing from their *Communion*, which is Aim'd at in this Speech.

But

But if the *Bishop* had been the *Author* of it, he wou'd, no Doubt, have done that *Justice* to the *Noble Historian*, as to have told his True and Real *Sentiments*, and not have Represented him as an *Occasional Conformist*, whom he knew to be far otherwise. And again, he wou'd not have brought an Argument of *Politicks*, for satisfying *Conscience*. That wou'd have come better from any other hand.

XI. Wherefore this *Speech* Acts the *Bishop* better, where it makes him give a Reason as to *Conscience*, Parag. 15. p. 6. *I thought Communion with them was Lawful, for their Worship was not Corrupted.* But then the *Bishop* cou'd not have given so very Weak a Reason. Because this takes away all Separation, on Account of *Schism*, where the *Worship* is not Corrupted. Against which the *Schism* of *Korah* stands a *Rul'd Case*. And *St. Jude* tells us, ver. 11. of *Christians* who *Perish* in that same *Gain* saying. And the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, in the Case of the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, and other *Schismaticks*, who gave up their very *Lives* for the *Faith*, makes all against this. And sure the *Bishop* wou'd not Oppose his own single *Authority* against all these too.

Besides that, this Notion makes very Little of the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Church*, upon which *Christ* laid so great a *Stress*, as to call a Breach in it, the *Tearing* of his own *Body* in pieces. And all *Civil Societies* are so sensible of it, as to think it

that the Worst *Evil* can befall them, even the Dissolving of their *Constitution*. The same that *Discord* is in a *Family*; that *Mutiny* is in an *Army*; and *Rebellion* in a *State*; the same is *Schism* in a *Church*. And none take it more *Heinously* than *Schismatical Congregations*, when it happens amongst themselves. And the *Less* the *Causes* are for which Men *Separate*, their *Schism* is Reckon'd the *Greater* and more *Un-Excusable*.

And there is no End of the Consequences. When the *Presbyterians* took upon them to *Ordain* without *Bishops*, the *Independants* Quickly found the way to *Ordain* without *Presbyters*, and others after them, to set up *Ministers* of *Christ* (as they call them) without any *Ordination* at all. And as a Natural Consequence of this, to bring all *Priestly Administrations* into utter *Contempt*, and to be *Perform'd* by a *Woman*, as well as a *Man*, even the *Administration* of the Holy *Sacrament*, which is made but the *Remembrance* of a *Friend*, like *Drinking* of a *Health*, which may be *Begun* by any in the *Company*, by a *Woman* as well as any other. All this is set up in our late *Pamphlets*, I will Name one, which has been often *Advertis'd* in our *Printed-News-Papers*, call'd *The Principles of the Protestant Reformation Explain'd, in a Letter of Resolution concerning Church-Communion*. London, Printed in the Year 1704. where p. 10, 11. You will find what is above Mention'd.

This of *She-Apostles* and *Priests* did a little *Shock* Serjeant *Hook*. But otherwise, as to that of Overthrowing all Stated *Church-Communion* and *Government*, the *Serjeant Learned in the Law*, go's fully in with that *Author*, and Quotes this very *Book* of his with Approbation, in what the *Serjeant* calls *Catholicism without Popery*. Part. 2. p. 57. Printed, 1704. And often *Advertis'd*.

All these *Pamphlets* are Wrote in behalf of *Occasional Conformity*. And the way to Salve it, is, by making no *Communion* necessary. And then soon follows no *Church*, and no *Religion*! Can the like be said of any who Wrote for the *Bill*?

Therefore we see the *Necessity* of keeping up *Episcopacy*. To allow of other *Ordinations* without *Bishops*, is Breaking the *Dike*, which will let all this *Inundation* in upon us.

If *Christians* liv'd together where no *Episcopal Ordination* cou'd be had, they Might and Ought to Meet and serve God, in a *Publick* Manner, as far as their *Circumstances* wou'd Allow it. This is *Lay-Communion*. And God wou'd not Charge upon them the want of the Holy *Sacraments*, or other things which they cou'd not have without *Priestly* Administration. And to bear with the want of these, under such an *Invincible Necessity*, is more of *Humility* and *Reverence* to God and his *Laws*; than to take upon us, of our own Heads, and without any *Commission* from him, to Consecrate *Priests* our selves. Which Honour no Man taketh to him-

himself. And none can give it but God. None other can Impower any to *Represent* him, to *Transact* with Mankind in his *Name*; and to *Sign* and *Seal* his *Covenant* with them. Thus the *Jews* all over the *World* have *Rightly* *Determin'd* rather to have no *Sacrifices* at all, than not at the *Place* to which they were *Limited* by the *Law*. Which place *Jerusalem* being not in their *Power*, and their *Temple* *Destroy'd*, they *Infer*, That it is the will of *God* their *Sacrifices* shou'd *Cease*, till they are *Restor'd* again. But that they cannot make a *New Law*, or observe the *Law* given them otherwise than as that *Law* has *Com-manded*. The Example of *Uzzah* is a *Rule* to us, as well as to them that *God* will not *Accept* the *Breach* of his *Institution*, tho' with an *Intention* of *Preserving* it. But the want of his *Ordinances* will not be *Imputed* where there is not a *Possibility* of having them. The *Breach* of his *Institution*, is *Our Act*: But the being *Depriv'd* of the *Benefit* of his *Ordinances*, if it be not our *Fault*, will not be our *Crime*. If we must not set up other *Sacraments* (Supposing us *Depriv'd* of the *True* ones, which *Christ* left us) neither must we *Another Priesthood*. It is *Usurping* the *Prerogative* of *God* to our selves. And *Rendring* our whole *Service* *Sacrilegious*, like the *Offerings* of *Korah*. It is the *Iniquity* of our *Holy* things.

XII. Which it were to be wish'd was so much Abated as this *Speech* tells us, p. 3. *Paragr.* 8. *At least a Fourth part, if not a Third part.* For so

much it says the *Dissenters* are *Lessen'd* since the *Toleration*. But how do's this Appear? For their *Meetings* are so much at least, *Encreased* every where. And their *Party* is grown *Stronger*, at *Court*, in *Parliament*, and at all *Elections*. And they never were so *Clamorous* and *Threatning* as now. One chief *Topick* of their *Pamphlets* is to *Boast* and *Terrifie* with their *Numbers*, and say they are the *Major* part of the *Nation*. Which is as little *True*, as that their *Numbers* are *Lessen'd* by the *Toleration*.

But if this *Latter* were *True*, how do's it concern the *Bill*, which do's not *Meddle* with their *Toleration*? Will being put into *Power* lessen their *Numbers* too!

Therefore it was most unbecoming his *Lordship* to make him say in this *Speech*, p. 7. *Paragr.* 17. *In my Diocess, those who are Occasional Conformists out of Principle, who come sometimes to Church, and go sometimes to Meetings, are without Number; who yet have no Office, and seem to Pretend to none. If they do not only Seem so to Pretend, this Bill do's not Affect them in the least. and the Church may Reap all the Benefit propos'd in this Speech, by their Occasional Conformity. So that this would be to make his Lordship argue quite besides the Point. Especially where he is made to say, in the same Paragr. I have heard but of One in Office in my Diocess, who goes to Meetings; and that is only to a Weekly Lecture. Then the Danger of Disobliging is not Great. It is but*

One to without Number. This is still Arguing for the *Bill*. And the *Occasional Conformists* out of *Principle* do likewise *Seem* to be much offended at those who do it for *Places*, as bringing the *Scandal* of *Hypocrisy* upon them all, and have Wrote against such *Occasional Conformity*. To these *without Number*, we must add those in the *Interest* of the *Church*, who generally through the Kingdom are much *Disgusted* at the *Rejection* of this *Bill*. And by the *Computation* here put upon the *Bishop* in his own *Diocess*, and Supposing it alike in all the other *Diocesses* of the *Nation*, there will be but *One* in *Each*, that is 26 in all, who are Gratify'd by the ill Fate of that *Bill*. And these Men are of no *Principle*, and a *Scandal* to *Religion*, as they are call'd in that Celebrated *Book* wrote on their side, *viz. Moderation a Vertue*. p. 7. where it is said, *I take such Occasional Conformity, to be a Scandalous Practise, a Reproach to Religion, and Offensive to all good Christians.*

But if those *without Number* in his Lordship's *Diocess*, who go sometimes to *Church*, and sometimes to *Meetings*, are Brought up in that Loose way, of thinking that there is nothing of *Government* left by *Christ* in his *Church*, nor a *Succession* of *Priesthood*, with Power of *Remitting* and *Retaining Sins*, of *Consecrating* and *Administring* his *Sacraments*, and *Blessing* in his *Name*: Or that this may be *Conferr'd*, by any 3 or 4 *Lay-Men* or *Women*; that is, who Consider the *Church* as a *Seet*

only, or Company of *People* who *Believe* such *Doctrines*, as the several sorts of the *Heathen Philosophers, Stoicks, Academicks, Epicureans, &c.* which a Man might *Change* every *Hour* of the *Day*, without being *Accountable* to any ; But cou'd not be *Excluded* or *Excommunicated* from being of such an *Opinion* ; and might *Appoint* whom he Pleas'd to *Read Lectures* to him, or *Preach*, upon such and such *Subjects* : But have no *Notion* of the *Church*, as a *Society*, under *Government*, with such *Powers* Committed to the *Governors*, of *Admitting* and *Excluding* out of the *Society*, and the *Privileges* of it ; and pursuant to such a *Notion*, are *Free* to go to any *Company*, of *People*, where they think *Christian* *Doctrine* is *Taught* ; and think themselves *Equally Safe* in any ; and therefore, go sometimes to *Church*, and sometimes to *Meetings*, as the *Humour* leads them, or they *Fancy* they are *Edify'd* : I say, if there be *Numberless* of this sort in the *Diocess* of *Sarum* (which *God* forbid) there is a sad *Account* of his *Lordship's Charge* : And instead of being of this or that *Church*, they are in no *Church* at all, if *Christ* did *Erect* his *Church* as a *Society*.

There are too Many of such *Occasional Conformists* in *England*. I shou'd be sorry, if it were *True*, that they *Encrease* so *Exceedingly* under the *Direction* of my *Lord Bishop* of *Sarum*. It is *Impossible* to be by his *Encouragement* ! Who in this same *Speech* (if it were his) *Paragr.* 16. p. 6. says, *That the Separation is form'd upon Error and Mistake,*

Mistake, and that true Edification is among us, and not among them, and that They are certainly to Blame, in every part of the Separation. No High-Flyer in England cou'd say more. And is it Possible he cou'd Encourage any to Go to Them, or Remain among Them, where no True Edification was to be had! And who were to Blame, in every Part of their Separation! Then such thorough Blameable Separation must be a Schism, or there Can be None!

Therefore, whoever Believes this *Speech* to be the *Bishop of Sarum's*, must Conclude, That he thinks all the *Separatists* of the *Nation* from the *Church of England*, to be In-excusable *Schismatics*.

XIII. But there is a *Caveat* put in at the Close of the *Speech*, for some others, *Nor can I consent (says Speech) to the Reckoning the Foreign Churches that are Tolerated among Us, which are by Name Excepted in the Act of Uniformity, among the Meetings of the Separatists from our Church.*

If they have *Meetings* of their own, on Account of the *Language*, and this be Allow'd, there is no Harm done. But if they Refuse to *Communicate* with Us, because we are *Episcopal* (which I suppose they do not) they wou'd then be *Schismatics* from the whole *Catholick Church*. For by the Rules of *Catholick Communion*, every *National* or *Neighbour Church* ought to *Communicate* with Another, where there are no sinful *Terms of Communion*.

munion Impos'd, or else, they Break the *Communion of Saints*.

But what Reason is Given in this Speech? Why thus, in the next words, *This will have a strange sound all the World over ; and will be a mighty Discouragement to all Abroad, who Expect Deliverance and Protection from hence ; when they understand that it is made so Criminal a thing among Us to Worship God with them, and according to their way.* And is this all the Reason given? Yes, every word.

Then this Cou'd not Come from any *Bishop*. What *Bishop* or *Christian* were he, who upon the Point of *Church Communion*, shou'd have nothing to offer, but a Parcel of poor *Politicks* ! And these *Feelish* too ! For do's not the *Emperour*, the *King of Portugal*, the *New King of Spain*, and the *Duke of Savoy* Expect *Deliverance and Protection from Hence*, and may be the *King of Poland* too, as well as *Holland* ? What *Discouragement* then will it be to the one more than to the other, that we Cannot *Worship God with them, and according to their way* ? Or, are the *Dutch* more *Zealous* than all the others, upon the Point of *Religion* ! Are *They* Turn'd *High-Church-Men* too !

XIV. But whatever *Latitude* or *Indifferency* they may have as to *Religion* or *Conscience* ; And however they may *Dispeuse with Occasional Conformity*, upon these Accounts, which lie not near their *Hearts* : Yet they know full well how to secure their *Government*, and their *Church*, *Establish'd by Law*.

Law; which they suffer none to *Invade* or *Infalt*, as *Ours* is every Day, in *Lew'd* and *Virulent Pamphlets*. Much less for any of the *Tolerated Communities* there, to set up for the true *Church* of the *Nation*; As several of our *Dissenting Pamphlets* here have done, Asserting the *Dissenters* to be true *Church* of *England*; And, on Account of their *Toleration*, to be like wise *Etablish'd by Law*; so that *Dan. Burges* has as much *Law* on his side, as the *Arch-Bishop* of *Canterbury*.

However, because there is some Difference betwixt being *Etablish'd* and *Tolerated*, the *Dissenters* have, of late, had a Great Aversion to that *Phrase*, of the *Church*, as *Etablish'd by Law*. And this *Speech* does Gratifie them in it, *Parag. 11. p. 5.* it makes the *Bishop* say, *I have been Jealous when I heard some Persons pretend too much Zeal for the Church of England, as by Law Etablish'd.* There is a Reason given, to serve for a Pretence, as if this were Meant only against the *Papists*. But it is so Foolish, as to Pass upon no Man of Common Sense. It is thus, *I knew one of the Eminentest Papists of the Age. who us'd often to say, he was for the Church of England, as by Law Etablish'd: I took the Liberty to Ask him, How such a Profession did Agree with his Sincerity? He answer'd, He look'd on the Laws of Queen Mary as yet in full force; for he thought Q. Elizabeth who Repeal'd them, had no more Right to the Crown, than Oliver Cromwel had; so that her Laws, were no Laws. But did that Eminentest Papist think That K. James I. K. Charles I. and K. Charles II. had no more Right to the Crown than Oliver Cromwel? Or, did he not know, That there were Laws in these Reigns which did Etablish the Church of England? So that this is a very simple Story; and wholly Unworthy the Bishop of Sa-*

lisbury. But the *Drift* of the *Speech* is Plain, to Run down that Discrimination of the *Church of England*, as by *Law Establish'd*, to give the *Dissenters* an Equal *Title* to it.

And therefore no Man can believe, That the *Bishop of Sarum* wou'd set up such Doctrine; who says, in the very next *Parag.* (as set down in this *Speech*) of himself, and the Rest of his *Bench*, *We have in the whole course of our Lives adhered to the Interest of the Church, at all Perils, and in all Times, without ever once, in any particular, leaning to the Dissenters.* Wou'd any make us believe, That he did not mean the *Church*, as by *Law Establish'd*? Or, That he would be *Jealous* of those who were *Zealous* for her? And that we must be put hereafter to Guess what he means when he speaks of the *Church*, or of the *Church of England*? Can the *Bishop of Sarum* have such a *Double Entendre*!

XV. But after all that can be said on behalf of the *Bishop*, the *Finishing-stroke* must be left to Himself. He only can Effectually Silence all this *Clamour* and *Scandal* Cast upon him, on Account of this *Speech*, by letting the *World* know, That his Lordship do's *Disown* it. After which, no one will have the Confidence to Put it upon him.

And *Ri. Chiswell* his Lordship's *Bookseller*, for whom it is said to be *Printed*, ought to do that Justice to his Lordship, as to give an *Advertisement*, that his *Name* was Falsely put to it, or that he had not the *Copy* from his Lordship.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

P. 6. l. 18. f. *having*, r. *have*. p. 23. l. 5. f. *Men*, r. *more*. l. 12. f. *True*, r. *Free*. p. 30. l. 6. f. *High-Allies*, r. *High-Fliers*. p. 31. l. 9. f. *Abjuration*, r. *Adjuration*. p. 35. l. 17. r. *his own*. p. 49. l. 6. r. *Congregations*.

390/12/39

